

Amendments to the Drawings:

Replacement sheets for FIGS. 1 - 6 are enclosed which formalize the drawings that were submitted with the application. Revisions to Figures 1 and 2 incorporate the changes required by the Examiner. Approval by the Examiner is respectfully requested.

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 are pending in the application. Claims 1-4, 7 and 8 are rejected. Claims 5 and 6 are objected to.

Figures 1 and 2 were objected to by the Examiner. Replacement drawings incorporating the changes are submitted herewith. Approval by the Examiner is respectfully requested. Formal drawings are also submitted herewith under separate Letter to the Official Draftsperson.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are objected to because of informalities.

Claims 3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as their invention.

By this amendment, the informalities in the claims noted by the Examiner have been corrected. In claim 6, the term R, G, and B respectively means Red, Green and Blue. See page 9, lines 28-31 of the Specification, wherein R, G, and B refer to color. These terms are well known in the art.

Claims 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Suzuki (6,078,302).

An important feature of the present invention is the estimation circuitry found in independent claim 1 which estimates panel current flowing in all of the pixels based on image data.

Suzuki relates to an LCD display which has a backlight. The drive current to the backlight is based upon a measurement of ambient lighting conditions and using an optimum brightness calculator. The present invention has nothing to do with a backlight but with adjusting pixel current. LCDs are field-effect devices which are not responsive to current and Suzuki is not making any estimation to control his backlight based on image data. Therefore, there would be no motivation in Suzuki for this important feature found in claim 1 which is believed to be unobvious.

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cok et al. (US 7,064,733).

Cok et al. and the present application are commonly assigned to the Eastman Kodak Company. Both of these inventions were assigned to Eastman Kodak at filing and remain assigned to Eastman Kodak. The present application was filed on March 29, 2004 and claims the priority date of April 8,

2003. The Cok et al. patent application was published on February 19, 2004. Accordingly, Cok et al. can not be used as a reference under 35 U.S.C. 103(c). Cok et al. uses a measuring system and not an estimation based on image data.

The remaining claims depend upon claim 1 and should be allowed along with it.

It is believed that these changes now make the claims clear and definite and, if there are any problems with these changes, Applicants' attorney would appreciate a telephone call.

In view of the foregoing, it is believed none of the references, taken singly or in combination, disclose the claimed invention. Accordingly, this application is believed to be in condition for allowance, the notice of which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 22,363

Raymond L. Owens/djw
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: 585-477-4653
Facsimile: 585-477-4646

If the Examiner is unable to reach the Applicant(s) Attorney at the telephone number provided, the Examiner is requested to communicate with Eastman Kodak Company Patent Operations at (585) 477-4656.